

CAG NEWSLETTER

Online Newsletter at:
www.lkyspp.nus.edu.sg/CAG/Newsletter

CONTENTS

Recent Workshops and Conferences	1, 3-5
Letter from the Director	2
CentrePoint	2
People at CAG	2
Faculty Spotlight	6
Focus on CAG	7
Research at CAG	7
Upcoming Events	8



Editor
Sandra Ng

Production
Bob Associates Design Consultants
www.bobassociates.com

Contributors
Benjamin Sovacool
Yeling Tan
Damon Vis-Dunbar
Special contribution from IISD

Centre on Asia and Globalisation
Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy
National University of Singapore
Oei Tiong Ham Building
469C Bukit Timah Road
Singapore 259772
Tel: +65 6516 8134
Email: CAG@nus.edu.sg
URL: www.lkyspp.nus.edu.sg/CAG

The CAG newsletter is published bi-annually.



NEWSLETTER SNAPSHOT

The Centre on Asia and Globalisation welcomes Dr. Stephen P. Cohen, Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy Studies, The Brookings Institution, as Senior Visiting Fellow. Dr. Cohen is also Visiting Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy. Read the Q&A with Dr. Cohen on **page 6**.

No issue on the global agenda is more in need of new governance approaches than energy policy. Asia's economic rise has irrevocably altered the structure of international energy markets. Read about Energy Research at CAG on **page 7**.

RECENT WORKSHOPS AND CONFERENCES

Roundtable on Global Energy Governance



Clockwise L to R: Roundtable Participants, Ilari Rantakari and Navroz Dubash

In association with the Helsinki Process, the “Roundtable on Global Energy Governance” brought more than 20 experts from around the world to the Centre on Asia and Globalisation for two days of intense discussions about energy governance from 5-6 November 2007. Speakers covered a diverse array of topics, discussing the types of institutions, arrangements, and practices that best promote energy governance; where the world needs to head after the Kyoto Protocol to fight climate change; and how changes in electricity and natural gas infrastructure in Southeast Asia are creating new challenges related to matching energy supply with rapidly growing energy demand.

While the workshop was intended to be preliminary in nature, a number of important themes emerged. A near consensus surfaced concerning the need for more accountability and transparency, especially related to more accurate pricing of energy services and inclusion of the public in decisions about the permitting and siting of energy facilities. A similar consensus emerged related to the extraordinary strain the coming impacts of climate change will place on all governments, especially those in the developing world that may not have the financial and human capital to rapidly respond to crises and developments.

The emerging research agenda proposed by workshop participants validates one of the key purposes of the Centre: to fill the gaping void that currently exists in global energy policy related to issues of governance. Until policymakers and lawmakers start to recognise that issues of energy security, supply, and reliability are inseparable from issues of good governance, it seems likely that rising prices, environmental degradation, and technological vulnerability will continue unabated. □



After its first birthday in August 2007, the Centre on Asia and Globalisation moved rapidly ahead with its research agenda. In the last few months we have created a wide range of research collaborations, and as of this month we are launching a major

new initiative on global governance in the Asian century.

Taking these in chronological order: In early November, we held a research workshop on energy governance, in association with the Helsinki Process (an initiative of the Finnish and Tanzanian governments to encourage multi-stakeholder dialogues and action on pressing global issues). The workshop brought together some of the world's leading thinkers to begin creating a comprehensive research agenda on energy governance, with papers ranging from energy investment to climate change governance to innovations in electricity regulation.

In December we held a second research workshop, this one in collaboration with the Asia Research Centre at Murdoch University, Western Australia. The workshop focused on governance innovations in Asia, looking at the wide variety of experiments in public policy making and accountability that are springing up throughout the region.

Both workshops have already sparked new work, ranging

from joint articles to plans for additional workshops. In just one example, from the energy workshop has come a new collaboration on understanding the regulatory processes that can encourage – or inhibit – widespread adoption of the new energy technologies that are needed to address climate change. In March 2008, we will host a regional meeting of electricity regulators, funded by the Asian Development Bank and cosponsored with Prayas, the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Partnership and the World Resources Institute.

Our largest research programme will be the new ST Lee Project on Global Governance in the Asian Century. With the generous support of Dr. S. T. Lee, this three-year project is bringing together top scholars from the best Asian and Western universities for a major reconsideration of the institutions of global governance in light of Asia's rise and the rapidly changing global agenda. Spearheaded by LKYSPP Dean (and CAG Faculty Associate) Kishore Mahbubani and myself, the project has the potential to help spark a badly needed consensus on how to transform the world's systems for managing global issues.

At the same time, the Centre continues to take seriously its responsibility to serve as a major resource for public outreach and education, and we are continuing our active programme of public seminars and conferences. We hope to see you there. □

Ann Florini

CENTREPOINT

Seminars at CAG round out the Autumn calendar in 2007.



On 7 November 2007, **Professor Thomas Heller** gave a seminar on "Negotiating the Road Beyond Kyoto". This timely lecture highlighted the dynamics of global negotiations and where they were headed one month before the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in Bali, Indonesia. Professor Heller is the Lewis Talbot and Nadine Hearn Shelton Professor of International Legal Studies, Stanford Law School. He is also Senior Fellow, Stanford Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies. If you missed this lecture, you can view it online at www.lkyspp.nus.edu.sg/CAG.

Dr. Robert K. Dixon, Head of the Energy Technology Policy Division, International Energy Agency (IEA), discussed energy policies, challenges and opportunities of Asian nations on 11 September 2007. His seminar, titled "Energy Policies and Technologies for a New Millennium: Perspectives on Asian Global Competitiveness" drew a crowd of over 100 people from government agencies, energy companies, advocacy organizations, students and faculty.



On 23 November 2007, **Dr. Tikki Pang** gave a seminar titled "Global Governance of Health Research - Current Perspectives and Future Challenges". The seminar provided a snapshot of global health problems and analysed the current landscape of global health research governance. Dr. Pang is the Director of Research Policy & Cooperation at the World Health Organization. □

PEOPLE AT CAG



Yeling Tan joined the Centre on Asia and Globalisation as a Research Fellow in November, 2007. Yeling holds a B.A. in Economics and International Relations from Stanford University (Honors, Distinction, Phi Beta Kappa). After graduation, she was awarded the Tom Ford Fellowship and worked on economic development and governance issues at The Asia Foundation, which included field attachments in Indonesia and Bangladesh. Yeling has 4 of years of experience in international security policy at the Ministry of Defence's Policy Office in Singapore, working under a government scholarship. She first served as a staffer on the Indonesia Desk, and later as Head of the US Desk. □

1st Annual Forum of Developing Country Negotiators

Special contribution by Damon Vis-Dunbar, IISD



On 1-2 October 2007, the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) and the Centre on Asia and Globalisation held the 1st Annual Forum of Developing Country Negotiators. The Forum brought together some 30 negotiators from 25 developing countries for two days of intensive sessions. The event was of particular interest to the Centre because international investment law and policy is an integral part of the broader range of issues surrounding global governance.

One of the purposes of the Forum was to strengthen the capacity of developing country officials who negotiate international investment agreements (IIAs). These international treaties, entered into between governments at both the bilateral and regional level, provide a variety of rights and protections to foreign investors. IIAs have grown much more complex in recent years, and a number of speakers commented that developing countries are at a stark disadvantage when negotiating with wealthier countries that have greater resources to throw into negotiations.

“IIAs don’t substitute for institutional development, and in some cases might erode domestic institutions.”

It was noted during the opening session that while developed countries have institutions like the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) to develop common strategies on international investment, no equivalent exists for developing countries. As such, the Forum provided the opportunity to do some strategic thinking about how developing country negotiators might best address their common challenges.

One of the areas of discussion was whether IIAs actually encourage foreign direct investment (FDI). Despite some 10 years of research on the question, there is no conclusive answer



on whether IIAs improve FDI flows. The discussion focused on how IIAs don’t substitute for institutional development, and in some cases might erode domestic institutions (for example, facilities for investor-state arbitration can relieve pressure to strengthen the domestic legal system).

Participants also discussed some of the common provisions found in IIAs and their interpretation by tribunals in arbitrations involving foreign investors and host governments. One of the key standards on the protection of foreign investors is that of fair and equitable treatment (FET). It was argued that when interpreting the FET standard, it is important that tribunals also take into account other competing interests, such as those of communities and the environment. FET should be seen, in this regard, as a requiring fairness for all stakeholders, including local communities and governments, not just investors.

The final session of the Forum focused on whether there are elements of a “Southern Agenda” on investment. There are challenges related to negotiating IIAs which are particularly problematic for developing countries. At the top of the list is the need to strengthen capacity to negotiate informed and strategic treaties that strike the appropriate balance between the need to attract more foreign direct investment and the need to serve a wide range of public policy objectives, including economic development. □

Kanishka Jayasuriya, Garry Rodan

Boyd Fuller, Ruth Greenspan Bell,
Shahar Hameiri, Sunaina Lowe

Workshop Participants

Rajat Ganguly, Chaiwat Satha-Anand,
Nathan Quimpo, Sunaina Lowe

New Modes of Governance in the Asia Pacific

On 3-4 December 2007, the Centre on Asia and Globalisation and the Asia Research Centre at Murdoch University in Western Australia convened a workshop on New Modes of Governance in the Asia Pacific. This event, the first in an on-going research collaboration between the two centres, brought together scholars from Southeast Asia, Australia, Japan, and the US.

This exploratory workshop was divided into four thematic areas. The first dealt with private and public institutions. Participants looked at examples of greater political participation in Asian countries such as Malaysia, the Philippines, Cambodia and Vietnam, and highlighted the need to distinguish between political accountability on the one hand and political responsiveness and technocratic accountability on the other. The workshop also examined the transformation of the courts. One participant used examples of courts taking on political conflicts in Thailand, Taiwan and the Philippines to discuss the judicialisation of politics in Asia, and the implications of this trend for the nature of democratisation.

“Governance gaps in regional institutions such as ASEAN, APEC and the East Asia Summit had led to domestic public demand for more civil society action at the transnational level.”

The workshop then examined the private provision of public goods, firstly in the case of public housing failures in the Philippines, and secondly in the provision of maritime security in Southeast Asia. These two studies raised broader questions relating to the transformation of state authority, whether such private services undermined public governance, and the role of regulation in the private provision of public goods.

The second theme dealt with energy, environment and governance. Participants examined the global implications of governance failures in energy, and discussed the massive innovation needed to deal with the collective energy policy problem. The potential research to be undertaken included identifying the governors of energy, examining the role of non-traditional actors, assessing the potential of private governance and private sector codes of conduct, and exploring the potential of disclosure-based regulation.

Participants then looked at both local and transnational approaches to managing climate change and environmental issues

in the Asia Pacific. They considered specific local governance techniques for tackling climate change in India, China and the US, and discussed the dangers of expanding context-specific programmes to the global scale. Participants also examined the role of transnational advocacy networks in government environmental programmes in Japan and Korea. The discussion touched on the relationship between the strength of state authority and the formation and effectiveness of transnational networks, as well as the importance of being sensitive to local value systems in formulating environmental policy.

The third set of issues dealt with transnationalism, regionalism and accountability. Participants observed that Asian governments were transforming their governance and regulatory systems at the national level to respond to transnational and regional problems. An examination of the Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands (RAMSI) led to the observation that new regionalism in the South Pacific focused on a transformation of the state and a shift of power out of the formal state apparatus into expert networks, rather than a transformation between states. Participants also looked at regional institutions and transnational civil society networks. The argument was made that the governance gaps in regional institutions such as ASEAN, APEC and the East Asia Summit had led to domestic public demand for more civil society action at the transnational level.

The fourth area of focus was on governing conflict through political autonomy. Participants discussed the failures in state approaches to governing minorities, and looked at regional autonomy as a possible solution. The discussion first covered the case of failed autonomy in Mindanao, and examined the ways in which corruption and patrimonial politics undermined the peace process. Participants also studied cases where autonomy was a politically and socially unviable option, such as in southern Thailand. The discussion that followed dealt with a more successful example of autonomy as a solution for conflict, in the case of Aceh in Indonesia. Participants explored the key principles used to resolve the conflict and establish autonomy in Aceh. One participant observed that corruption amongst former GAM fighters now in the government, and the maintenance of central authority over the provincial bureaucracy, could undermine longer term prospects for peace. Finally, participants examined alternative dispute resolution mechanisms in Asia, and considered the possibility that a more effective approach to conflict resolution may lie in getting people to redefine the language of conflict and to interact outside of established modes. □

International Advisory Group Meeting on Managing Global Insecurity



L to R

Front: *Carlos Pascual, Lalit Mansingh, Sadako Ogata, Kishore Mahbubani, Bruce Jones*

Row 2: *Martine Letts, Wing Thye Woo, Mely Caballero-Anthony, Helen Nesadurai, Ann Florini*

Row 3: *Warwick McKibbin, Amitav Acharya, Satosha Iwakiri, Holly Benner, Qin Yaqing, Ayo Obe*

Row 4: *S. Jaishankar, Kate Chadwick, Jessie Duncan, Yeling Tan, Rifaat Hussain, Steve Stedman*

On 9-10 December 2007, the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy and the Centre on Asia and Globalisation hosted a meeting of the International Advisory Group of the Project on Managing Global Insecurity (MGI). The MGI project is run by The Brookings Institution, Stanford University's Center for International Security and Cooperation, and New York University's Center on International Cooperation. The meeting brought together Advisory Group Members and regional experts to discuss how to strengthen the multilateral security system. The wide-ranging and frank discussions covered the topics of global governance in the Asian century, non-proliferation and disarmament, Asian regional security architecture, and energy security and global climate change.

Participants agreed on the pressing need to come up with a better response to the complex challenges facing today's globalised world. There was much discussion on the notion of "responsible sovereignty" as a basis for the new international order, and general agreement on the need for the US to fully commit to a rules-based international system.

Participants then turned to discuss Asian views and roles in the current global order. There was general agreement on the contrast between the current optimism in Asia versus the prevailing pessimism in the West. Several participants pointed out issues which they felt had undermined the international system, such as Iraq and the US approach on the Israel-Palestine conflict. While recognising that Asian countries had become more active in international dialogues, many participants noted that Asia needed to do more, and to actively generate Asian initiatives on how to strengthen the global system and respond to shared challenges such as climate change. Participants also agreed on the need to actively consider the

roles of the private sector and civil society in strengthening the global system.

On the topic of non-proliferation and disarmament, one participant questioned the value of multilateral cooperation and the NPT when proliferation issues were realistically only determined by the actions and interests of a few, powerful nation states. The discussion touched on the point that Asia needed to take a stronger interest in non-proliferation, given the number of Asian nuclear states, and the region's growing appetite for energy. The argument was made that for a variety of reasons, states may be increasingly ready to break out of the NPT, and the world could be facing a second nuclear age. There were currently no procedures in place to deal with such a scenario. On balance, participants agreed on the need to strengthen the non-proliferation regime and improve international dialogue and cooperation, to deal with Iran, North Korea, non-state proliferation, and to maintain the US-Japan security umbrella, while addressing the world's growing demand for more sources of energy.

Moving to the topic of Asia's regional security architecture, participants discussed the value of the Asian approach to international affairs. One participant pointed to the pragmatism of Asian states, ASEAN's focus on building up informal habits of cooperation, and commitment to the process of continual engagement. These habits had led to the conditioning of state behaviour, and had created an ASEAN that, while made up of weak states, had the geopolitical competency to engage China and India, to form the core of regional arrangements such as the East Asian Summit, and help create an unprecedented stability in a region of emerging medium powers. Another participant noted that ASEAN remained unable to deal with crises such as Timor Leste and North Korea. Bilateral tensions still threatened regional security. In addition, the emerging dynamics in ASEAN – such as the agreement to create a security community, and the increasing activism of civil society organisations – would pose challenges for the internal coherence of the organisation.

The final topic was on energy security and global climate change. Participants debated the value of using the UN as the institutional framework for climate change, given that the bulk of the action needed to make progress lay with the relatively few major current and future emitters. Participants also discussed the need for a flexible arrangement to adapt to the fundamental uncertainties in climate change and to adapt to improvements in science and technology. Countries would benefit from arrangements with built-in commitments for regular renegotiations. There was also discussion on the need to allow for policies that responded to unique national circumstances, rather than to tie all nations to uniform standards. There was also debate on the need to create market incentives with credible price signals, and the inherent political and social obstacles to creating such a system. Participants also discussed the value of disclosure-based regulations versus market-based approaches. □

Faculty spotlight highlights scholars and associates who collaborate with the Centre on Asia and Globalisation on our research agenda. In this issue we feature Stephen Philip Cohen, Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy Studies, The Brookings Institution.



Stephen P. Cohen

Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy Studies, The Brookings Institution

On 7 January 2008, the Centre on Asia and Globalisation welcomed Stephen P. Cohen as Senior Visiting Fellow. Dr. Cohen is also Visiting Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy. Dr. Cohen joined The Brookings Institution as Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy Studies in 1998 after a career as a professor of Political Science and History at the University of Illinois. In 2004 he was named as one of the five hundred most influential people in the field of foreign policy by the World Affairs Councils of America.

Dr. Cohen is the author, co-author or editor of over twelve books, mostly on South Asian security issues, the most recent being *Four Crises and a Peace Process: American Engagement in South Asia* (2007), *The Idea of Pakistan* (2004), and an edited volume published by the National Academy of Science that explores the application of technology to the prediction, prevention or amelioration of terrorist acts. A book on the future of the Indian military is now in progress.

Dr. Cohen has taught in Japan (Keio University) and India (Andhra University), and has consulted for numerous foundations and government agencies; he was a member of the Policy Planning Staff (Department of State) from 1985-87. Dr. Cohen is currently a member of the National Academy of Science's Committee on International Security and Arms Control, and was the founder of several arms control and security-related institutions in the US and South Asia. He received his undergraduate and graduate education at the University of Chicago, and the Ph.D. in Political Science and Indian Studies from the University of Wisconsin.

Dr. Cohen is married to Roberta Brosilow, and they have six children and seven grandchildren.

We interviewed Dr. Cohen on the current political situation in Pakistan and his plans for his 4 month stay in Singapore.

Q. Why are you coming to Singapore?

A. From a research point of view it is a great place from which to view both South Asia and East Asia (I've lived and taught in both India and Japan, and visited China many times) and learn about S. E. Asia, as well as Singapore itself. Additionally, I enjoy teaching, and this gets me back into the classroom in a stimulating environment with students from many important countries. I'll also be finishing a book on the Indian military, and the work environment at NUS is superb.

Q. You conduct research on South Asia, and you've written extensively on proliferation and on the militaries of India and Pakistan. You have argued for a non-proliferation half-way house since 1990 and called it "an admittedly imperfect response to an imperfect situation, but far better than the status quo". Can you explain what you mean by this?

A. I've never believed that states can be coerced into joining the NPT if they have real security problems,

but that it is worth the effort to get them to join in broader arms control and nonproliferation goals. It is likely that I will be organising a conference in Singapore on this subject with my Brookings colleague, Ivo Daalder, in March.

Q. The January 5th issue of the Economist says that Pakistan is the world's most dangerous place. What do you think?

A. Yes, I'd agree that along several dimensions Pakistan is very dangerous—both to itself and to its neighbours, and to states very distant. Its domestic violence has increased dramatically, as a government it still supports, one way or another, extremist groups operating in both India and Afghanistan (the Taliban in the case of the latter), and its record on the proliferation of nuclear technology is perhaps the worst in the world. While it claims that its technology and its nuclear weapons are under control, we have no independent verification of this assertion. So, as I wrote in my book four years ago, Pakistan has become one of

the major foreign policy problems for the US—and I'd add, for other countries as well.

Q. You will be teaching a course on disaster management at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy. Why did you decide on this topic, and what do you plan to cover in the course?

A. I've always had an interest in the public and governmental responses to mass death, be they by natural or manmade disaster, and for a number of years taught such a course at the University of Illinois, where I was a professor of history and political science. I have written one book on natural disaster (the Andhra Cyclone of 1977), and written shorter pieces on the response to the Tsunami. This course gives me a chance to share my knowledge on the way in which states (and peoples) of different culture respond to disasters, and renew and refresh my own understanding as well. There's a Latin phrase, which translated reads "Teach that you may learn," I hope to both share my knowledge and learn from my LKY School students. □

FOCUS ON CAG



Awards

Benjamin Sovacool, Post Doctoral Research Fellow at CAG, received the Paul T. Hiser Exemplary Publication Award for his 2006 article "Reactors, Weapons, X-Rays and Solar Panels: Using SCOT, Technological Frame, Epistemic Culture, and Actor Network Theory to Investigate Technology".

CAG in the News

Staff of CAG are regularly sought for their opinions. Recently, CAG researcher Benjamin Sovacool, gave the following interviews:

November 5, 2007	Interview (Television) on Channel News Asia <i>Renewable Energy and Singapore</i>
October 25, 2007	Interview (Radio) on KOPN 89.5 FM Columbia, Missouri <i>What are the Alternatives to Coal and Nuclear?</i>
October 3, 2007	Interview (Television) on Bloomberg News <i>Biofuels and Energy Efficiency in the Transportation Sector</i>

RESEARCH AT CAG

In each issue of our newsletter we highlight an area of research that staff and faculty associates of the Centre on Asia and Globalisation are engaged in. In this issue, we focus on **Energy Research at CAG**.

No issue on the global agenda is more in need of new governance approaches than energy policy. Asia's economic rise has irrevocably altered the structure of international energy markets. Conventional forms of supply barely match the growing energy demand, while vulnerable energy infrastructure and political turmoil bring risks of conflict and energy insecurity. Energy production and use continue to be intrinsically tied to environmental degradation, while nearly two billion people lack access to basic energy services needed to improve their quality of life.

These myriad problems reflect governance failures at all levels. The world lacks an effective, or even marginal, structure for global decision making on energy policy. No international organisation effectively brings together the major energy players. Global energy markets are extremely volatile, distorted by subsidies, poorly regulated, and fractured by misleading price signals. At the national and sub-national levels, energy policy is usually a confused jumble of regulations imposed by multiple regulators, who are often working at cross purposes

and confronting jurisdictional conflicts. Faced with the looming danger of climate change, it is clear that business as usual in the energy sector cannot continue without seriously endangering human well-being.

In response to these challenges, the Centre on Asia and Globalisation (CAG) has put together an innovative and ambitious research agenda on energy and energy governance. The research agenda has four broad components. The first focuses on global governance and energy. To what degree do existing regional and global institutions of energy governance exhibit autonomous capacity to provide energy-related public goods and to shape the expectations and behaviour of governments and other sectors? Where do institutional gaps exist, and how might those gaps be filled? To answer these questions, CAG is mapping out existing relevant international institutions and evaluating the work of institutions from the IEA to various regional forums such as ASEAN Plus Three. It will then assess a variety of proposals for improving global energy governance through new or expanded inter-governmental organisations. The research also tackles

alternative approaches to energy governance. These include assessing the roles of corporations and advocacy groups, evaluating the effectiveness of public-private partnerships, and looking at emerging tools and techniques, such as disclosure-based regulation, participatory governance and networked governance.

“Energy policy is usually a confused jumble of regulations imposed by multiple regulators.”

The second research component deals with the manner in which multilateral development banks, such as the Asian Development Bank and the World Bank, have attempted to partially fill the inter-governmental void associated with energy governance. CAG is interested in examining the forms of governance established by these multilateral lenders, analysing the resulting impact upon states and societies, and deriving policy recommendations for decision makers.

Third, CAG is conducting research into the governance of specific energy

continued from page 7

infrastructure, looking at natural gas and oil pipelines beyond their functions as key arteries for trade and economic growth. There is a complex interplay between infrastructure and energy policy and security, human rights, and international politics. Pipelines can reflect the quality of governance, and different forms of governance exert great influence on the quality of and need for pipelines. Pipelines are well established as controversial pieces of infrastructure. However, pipelines are also promoted as assisting in bridging regional difficulties. CAG's research investigates how such infrastructure projects affect trade flows and regional economies at the macro level as well as social cohesion and ecosystem integrity at the micro level. One on-going project is assessing the governance of the trans-ASEAN pipelines in relation to pros and

cons that are associated with such cross-border infrastructure.

The final research component is on national policy and renewable energy. Despite the emerging global consensus on the need to shift from fossil fuels, renewable energy technologies continue to face immense social, political, regulatory, and economic barriers in most countries. Policymakers around the world are experimenting with a variety of policy mechanisms to promote distributed and renewable energy technologies. CAG is interested in exploring the factors which determine the success or failure of renewable energy policy mechanisms. What policies promote or inhibit the widespread adoption of distributed and renewable energy supply options at the national level? CAG's research examines different types of policy mechanisms (e.g.

investment and production tax credits, green power programs, feed-in-tariffs) and explores the costs and benefits of each approach for promoting renewable energy technologies in Southeast Asia.

The IEA estimates that a "business as usual" path on energy policy would require cumulative investment of more than \$20 trillion (in year-2005 dollars) over 2005-2030. Such a massive investment need raises major governance questions. Perhaps the most profound challenge of the 21st century is to find ways to steer that investment so that the world develops energy systems that work for all. CAG's research will provide new insights into appropriate institutional structures and regulatory mechanisms at the global, regional, and national levels for dealing with the world's urgent energy problems. □

UPCOMING EVENTS

Nuclear Proliferation Workshop

Co-sponsored with The Brookings Institution

Date

Thursday - Friday, 6 - 7 March 2008

Time

8.30am - 5.00pm

Venue

Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, NUS

BY INVITATION

Forum on Clean Energy, Good Governance and Regulation

Co-sponsored with the World Resources Institute, Prayas Energy Group, Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Partnership
With Funding from the Asian Development Bank

Date

Monday - Tuesday, 17 - 18 March 2008

Time

8.30am - 5.00pm

Venue

Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, NUS

BY INVITATION

The Natural State Lecture by Douglass C. North

Spencer T. Olin Professor in Arts and Sciences
Washington University in St. Louis, USA.
1993 Nobel Prize in Economics

Date

Monday, 10 March 2008

Time

TBC

Venue

Law School Auditorium, NUS Bukit Timah Campus

Open to the public

Corrections: Volume 1 Number 1: Rani Das received her MBA from Vancouver University and The International University, Vienna, Kiev.

"Attend" CAG Events on the Web

The Centre on Asia and Globalisation will be taping many of its public lectures, making them available for viewing on our website. Please visit www.lkyspp.nus.edu.sg/CAG to view recorded events and check in for future lectures.

For comments and suggestions, please contact our editor at sng@nus.edu.sg

Energy Fact:

The Next 10 Years are Critical - the World Energy Outlook Makes the Case for Stepping up Co-operation with China and India to Address Global Energy Challenges

If governments around the world stick with existing policies – the underlying premise of the World Energy Outlook Reference Scenario – the world's energy needs would be well over 50% higher in 2030 than today. China and India together account for 45% of the increase in global primary energy demand in this scenario. Both countries' energy use is set to more than double between 2005 and 2030.

(Source: World Energy Outlook 2007. International Energy Agency.)